

Tuesday, on which occasion they maltreated the railroad employes, tore up the track, and exhibited their contempt for the Marshal and the authority with which he was invested.

Two men were arrested in Boston on Wednesday evening on suspicion of forgery—checks for various amounts on different New York banks having been found in their possession.

Our Harrisburg correspondent seems to be of the opinion that the Pennsylvania State works will be eventually sold, and the proceeds applied to the reduction of the State debt. He quotes the bill having this object in view, recently introduced in the Legislature.

Following close upon the announcement that some sixty persons perished by the burning of the steamer Georgia, at New Orleans, last Saturday, we have a telegraphic dispatch stating that four negroes were burned to death by the destruction of the steamer Eagle, while on her way from Columbus to Apalachicola, on Monday. The South appears to be fast regarding her former notoriety for horrible steamboat calamities. Scarcely a week has gone by of late that has not been characterized by loss of life from the sinking, exploding or burning of vessels.

A large amount of property has been destroyed, and the laborers of planters materially interfered with, by recent frosts in the South. A dispatch from Chattanooga states that the Tennessee river was rapidly rising, the whole country overflooded, and that places almost inaccessible except by boats.

One hundred thousand dollars have been subscribed to the stock of the Sanbury and Erie Railroad by ten Philadelphia merchants.

Among the reports of judicial proceedings published in the morning's paper is a romantic case of a mother claiming the custody of her child in the Superior Court; decision in the U. S. Circuit Court in a case growing out of the Methodist Episcopal Church difficulty; the case of Hailstrom in the U. S. District Court; investigation of a charge of revolt at sea by the U. S. Commissioner; an important decision in Admiralty, &c.

We elsewhere publish a full report of the proceedings of the Committee of Councilmen to whom was referred the proposition to cart the site of the Central Park.

The annexed is a summary of a portion of the contents of to-day's inside pages:—Letters from Quebec and Caracas; Prohibitory liquor law of Maryland; church discipline, detection and ungewing of a minister at Albany; interesting habeas corpus case, and descent upon rondo rooms at Cincinnati; will of Judah Touro; Comptroller's report on salaries; Board of Education; commercial, political, theatrical and miscellaneous news, &c.

The Nebraska Question and the City Press. There can no longer be any doubt that the Nebraska controversy is about to revive the agitation which the passage of the fatal Missouri compromise first aroused. And, as the last flicker of a dying lamp seems to derive unusual brilliancy from the approach of death, so the prospect of the final close of the quarrel appears to lend new virulence to the disputants and fresh acrimony to the debate. As usual of late years, the first combatants in the field are the members of the New York press. In their responsible position as leaders of public opinion on this continent, and joint rulers with Congress of the American Union, the enlightened journalists of this city are busily engaged in forming the public mind in accordance with the dictates of their own reason or feelings. The bulk of our contemporaries have broken ground against Senator Douglas's project. The Tribune assails it with its usual illogical violence; the Times is very severe on the measure; the Journal of Commerce expressed a faint concern at first, and then relapsed into silence "affrighted at the sound itself had made"; the Post was unusually lively and facetious upon the "Little Giant"; the Express, tired of stealing matters and ideas from the Herald, began to steal from the Tribune; and finally, to pass over a host of minor journals, the Courier and Enquirer frankly espoused the anti-slavery cause. It is not a little remarkable that the years 1840 to 1850 witnessed a precisely similar movement on the part of the New York press, in relation to the Wilnot proviso controversy. It affords us some satisfaction to recollect that on that occasion the New York Herald was the only journal which from the first, spoke out boldly on the side of the constitutional rights of the South, and singly advocated the course which our assembled representatives finally adopted and the country unanimously ratified. All our contemporaries were carried away by the fanatical excitement stimulated by Martin Van Buren and his adherents, and supported by William H. Seward and his clique. Foremost among those journals which demanded fresh violations of the constitution was the Courier & Enquirer, then, as now, under the charge of an assistant editor in the absence of the principal proprietor and conductor. Its course, as our readers will remember, damaged its character, injured its popularity and endangered its standing; and the chief proprietor, seeing the course affairs were taking on his return, had no other alternative than to apologise to his supporters and reverse the course of his journal, to his own and his deputy's grievous mortification. The gentleman who succeeded the latter at the helm of our contemporary seems to have derived little profit from the lesson; he appears bent on acquiring his experience in person, and unless we are mistaken, he will be gratified ere long.

It is not to be expected that any influential class of the community will allow such articles as that in Wednesday's Courier to go forth to the world as the expression of their real sentiments. It is well enough for a few literary men to argue that, because the unconstitutionality of the Missouri compromise was not brought prominently before the public during the thirty years following its enactment, therefore it was not regarded as unconstitutional by those best qualified to judge; but the thinking minds of the community will draw a very different inference from the fact. In the first place, whether our public men were really silent on the point or no, the main question—was the law constitutional? Had Congress the power to prohibit slavery in new States—would not be affected one iota by the fact. A thousand causes may have operated to restrain expressions of opinion on the subject. As in 1820, private ambition induced Clay, Calhoun, Crawford, and Jackson to lend their support to a law they disapproved, in order to gain the favor of the North; so at later periods similar motives may very probably, and really did in some instances, impose a like restraint on their successors in public life. Nor were they all silent. One of the number at all events, Mr. Calhoun, has left on record an emphatic condemnation of the compromise of 1820. Besides, from 1820 to the present day, the question has never fairly come up before the people; and statesmen from obvious reasons have rather sought to evade than probe it. Once, indeed, Mr. Senator Douglas did move in the Senate to prolong the line 36.30 to the Pacific, and declare it the boundary between slave and free labor. This injudicious proposition was fortunately negatived in the House. It was predicated on an unwelcome desire on the part of

Senator Douglas and his colleagues rather to affirm and consolidate a wrong policy than boldly to reverse it and return to a sound one. The Senate well knew the unconstitutionality of the Missouri law; and if the debates within its walls at that time he referred to, it will be found that Senators were not slow to express this opinion. Still, with the symptoms of a tremendous convulsion springing into life around them, neither Senator Douglas nor any one else had the courage to grapple with the difficulty in front, or strike at the root of the evil. Hence the notion of prolonging the line to the Pacific; and hence the strangely inconsistent proviso in the Texas boundary law. Men, at that day, had not confidence enough in the strength of the Union sentiment to say openly that Congress had no right to prohibit slavery.

The Courier denies that the laws of 1850 disturbed the compromise of 1820 because forsooth "it was in no speech" in Congress so pretended at the time." What reasoning! Is it not as clear as day that the former established the right of new States to choose for themselves in relation to slavery, while the latter delegated that right to Congress? Is this not the establishment of two antagonistic principles? In the face of such a palpable contradiction need we inquire whether other people noticed it three or four years ago? Is it not enough that any child can see it now?

But these are but the outworks of the Courier's position. We feel for the absent proprietor of that journal when he reads such a sentence as this, "It cannot be too well understood that the North, though it is not abolition, is anti-slavery in sentiment. It was so at the time of the formation of the constitution," &c. &c.

Let us devote a moment's examination to this precious sentiment. Let us inquire in the first place what evidence we have of the anti-slavery sentiment of the North at the time the constitution was framed? Is it the clause of the constitution granting representation in Congress to slave property—a greater concession to the South than the most ultra Southern man would demand to-day? Is it the slow and reluctant discovery by the North that slave-labor was more expensive than free, and must therefore be abandoned? Is it the glaring fact that notwithstanding the ordinance of 1787, slavery existed in Indiana, Illinois and Ohio till about the time of the Missouri compromise, and that when the last admitted of these States framed their State constitution, they expressly declared that all the slaves then within their borders should be slaves till their death—withstanding the superior cheapness of free labor? Here is strange evidence of the anti-slavery sentiment of the North in olden times.

What shall we understand by the North being "anti-slavery in sentiment, though not abolition," at the present day? If "abolition" means anything at all, it means practical and political anti-slavery in action. When therefore the Courier talks of this section of the country being "anti-slavery, but not abolition," it means in plain English that the North hates slavery, but dares not or does not choose to say so, or act upon the sentiment. What sort of hypocrisy is this, to be professed by a public journal! "The North," says the Courier, "is anti-slavery in sentiment." Of course it is: so are we all North, South, East and West. We all regard labor or slavery, for they are one and the same thing, as a thing hateful, part of the primal curse inflicted on man. We have our system of slavery, the South theirs. There is a system of hereditary labor, to which a certain race, not homogeneous with the white race, has gradually become subject; and to the laborer it is undoubtedly a curse. Ours is a system of hired labor, lasting for a time only instead of a whole life; recompensed with specific wages, and not with a perpetual guaranty of the wants of life; terminated at will, and not necessarily attended with any personal attachment between master and slave. This also, is a curse to the laborer. He is anti-slavery, inasmuch as he would like to live without the severe toll to which he is now driven. In this sense, the North is undoubtedly anti-slavery; but the slavery to which it is opposed is Northern as well as, and perhaps more than Southern. At all events, if the various kinds of labor or slavery existing in the world are to be judged by their incidental fruits as well as their direct characteristics, that species of slavery will meet with the strongest reprobation from enlightened men, which breeds the most vice, the most crime, the most misery, the most hardship among the laborers. In this view, we have no hesitation in declaring that our Northern slavery ought to be and must be far more hateful than the system of labor employed in the South.

Furthermore, if the Courier means to say that the North is so imbued with the fanatical prejudices of the clique into which it seems lately to have fallen, as to peril the Union for the sake of interfering with Southern slavery, we most emphatically assure our contemporary that he is wrong. We Northerners talk much and write more, and we read novels like Mrs. Stowe's, and are quite shocked with stories of Southern Legrees and inflexible Uncle Toms. But when it comes to the practical carrying out of these theories, we are not quite so ready to move as the Van Buren and the Seward and their organs are pleased to suppose. We have our railroad interest to protect; our cotton cargoes to secure; our agricultural prospects to look out for. We know perfectly well, when we think over these matters, that any approach to disunion would not only injure all these various interests, but would diminish the value of most kinds of Northern property one-half, and knock our stocks and securities down to zero. On the whole, therefore, we think, after having enjoyed a good outcry for a few months, that we will allow the South to continue to labor in their fashion, provided they let us labor in ours. This is the real character of the anti-slavery sentiment of the North. The *locum tenens* of the Courier might stir it up with profane.

THE SUPREME COURT ON MONOPOLIES.—In its recent decision upon the Morse patent, the Supreme Court of the United States decided adversely to the eighth claim of the Morse company, which was—

For the exclusive use of the motive power of electro-magnetism for the purpose of making signs or letters at any distance.

This covered the whole grant; but its rejection extinguishes the Morse company's claims to an absolute monopoly. Steam, water, air and electricity, cannot very well be allowed as a monopoly to any company. The Supreme Court has set a good example. Let us hope that it will be followed by Congress on the subject of the extension of other patent monopolies, beginning with Col's piano.

THE RELIGIOUS WAR ON THE FIVE POINTS.—A religious war has broken out among the rival missionary societies of the Five Points of a very violent, anti-Christian, and somewhat amusing character. So far has the controversy extended, that some of our daily contemporaries are taking sides in the quarrel, and are giving it the precedence over the Nebraska question. The Express is arrayed on the side of the Methodist ladies, and the Times is the champion of the recanting Mr. Pease, who has turned Presbyterian, and has set up an opposition establishment to that of the Methodist ladies, the founders of his original enterprise.

As far as we understand the case, Mr. Pease was first set up in the Old Brewery by the ladies of the Methodist Home Missionary Society. The experiment prospered. Money came flowing in abundantly. A large and elegant building was raised on the site of the Old Brewery, and set apart for the reclamation and amelioration, religiously and socially, of the miserable outcasts of that horrible locality of crime and wretchedness. Then came the split. Mr. Pease either abdicated, like Napoleon, or was turned adrift, like Louis Philippe, and we don't exactly know which. At all events, the present imbroglio at the Five Points is the result of his having gone over to the soft shell Presbyterians, and set up a philanthropic institution in opposition to that of the Methodist ladies, by whom he was first brought into public favor. Now the rival establishments are wrangling like conflicting politicians over the spoils. Manifestoes and counter manifestoes are issued; so that between the representations on the one side and the statements on the other it is impossible to tell which is right and which is wrong. We rather think that both parties are wrong, for while they are quarrelling over the plunder the devil is regaining his ascendancy in Fallow's Court.

The merits of this religious exposition are about the same as those which broke up the Baltimore Convention of 1848, and sent the Van Buren free soilers packing off to the Wilnot proviso to the Buffalo platform. The animus of the matter is the spoils. The Methodist ladies, abandoned by Mr. Pease, have been struggling on in their good work without him. But Mr. Pease, under his new alliance with the Presbyterian Church, and backed up by the Rev. Henry Ward Beecher, Uncle Tom's Cabin, the New York Tribune, the Times, W. H. Seward, and the "Hot Corn" society of the Five Points, has been getting the bulk of the dividends as well as the glory. The "Hot Corn" war rages, therefore, as violently as did the fight among the spoliators on the discharge of Collector Bronson. The original ladies in this missionary cause among our local heathen have appointed another clergyman; and their original clergyman has gone over to another society of ladies, commanding more puffy, more powerful allies, and more of the sinews of war, than the Methodist pioneers. But it seems to be the rule that the original movers in any great discovery, invention, or enterprise, must give way to alter intruders, who carry off the glory or the profits. Thus Columbus was cheated out of America, and thus Fitch was tricked out of his application of steam to navigation; and thus the modest Methodists, it appears, are to be crowded out of the Five Points by the powerful Presbyterians.

How much money has been collected between the two societies we are not informed. Perhaps as much as fifty thousand dollars, of which there appears to be no doubt that Mr. Pease, under the influence of Ward Beecher, Uncle Tom, the Tribune, the Times, and the "Hot Corn" associations, has carried off the lion's share. How much of this, in hot corn or cold victuals, has been distributed—how much in "old clo'" blankets, and fuel, how much in Bibles, how much in Solon Robinson's "Hot Corn" rebash of Ned Buntline's abominations, we don't know, and it may be none of our business to inquire. We are describing the war as it stands—this war between Methodists and Presbyterians, ladies and clergymen, and clergymen and ladies, and rival daily journals—the Catholic organ of Archbishop Hughes, meantime, fighting them all, with the desperation of a Turk and the unction of a Jesuit.

Now, we should like to have an exposition of this whole business, from beginning to end, from some well informed and impartial historian. Capt. Rynders, who has thrown such a flood of light upon the Missouri compromise question, or John Van Buren, who remains in the dark on that subject, might perhaps be able to enlighten us and the public upon this Five Points controversy. They know that Tammany Hall has always depended upon the locality—they know the necessities existing there for missionary enterprise; and though they may not be *au fait* in the nice distinctions between Methodist benevolence and Presbyterian philanthropy, they know all about the spoils, which is the main question. Between the Tribune, the Times, the Express, and the Freeman's Journal, we are completely befogged. Will not some benevolent and impartial person step forward and clear up the mystery. We have had enough of "Hot Corn" charity; now let us know the exact merits of this religious quarrel over the plunder. Let us have the truth, and the statistics of the spoils.

GEN. SCOTT AND THE LIEUTENANT-GENERAL.—We perceive that the Cabinet organ and its echoes throughout the country continue their dirty flings at the bill passed by the United States Senate, and now before the House, giving to Gen. Scott the title of Lieutenant-General, with some little addition to his salary, which, in his official position, is insufficient for his comfortable support.

The meanness, the paltry and dirty meanness, of party politicians and party scavengers, was never more strikingly exhibited than in this case. Gen. Taylor's well known fable of *Æsop* applies to these miserable party hacks most appropriately. Against a patriot who has served his country, to the satisfaction of the people, but who may possibly stand in the way of the scurvy schemes of these fellow politicians, they can always find some clap-trap excuse of constitutional, economy, bad precedent, or some such threadbare rubbish of knavish demagogues.

But we do not exactly understand these innuendoes and side thrusts of the Washington Union against this bill. The Union is doubtless supposed, by its provincial echoes, and by the spoliators of the House, to speak "by authority." This is what we desire to know. Does it give General Scott the cold shoulder "by authority"? It cannot be possible—it passes belief. Gen. Scott is now in his old age, and after a long life of faithful and efficient military services, crowning our arms with victory and our

country with glory in the battlefields of Canada and Mexico, it cannot be that Gen. Pierce entertains any such mean and detestable spirit of opposition to this bill before Congress as that most despicable spirit of meanness exhibited by the Cabinet organ and its partisan Jackals, forever howling on the track of the spoils.

We say it cannot be that the President of the United States shares in this despicable spirit of party hostility. He owes too much of gratitude to Gen. Scott to be guilty of such treachery as this. The military reputation which General Pierce brought home from Mexico was largely due to the kind attentions and consideration of Gen. Scott. The old chief's report, we understand, of the battle of Churubusco, as far as it related to the part performed by his subordinates, including General Pierce, was adopted from their own testimony, and in their own handwriting. The victory was achieved, and the General-in-chief was too magnanimous to be rigidly exact in his discriminations, and he gave the stamp of his own signature to their own testimony of themselves, as a good soldier reposing fully in the devotion of his subordinates is apt to do. It is not possible, therefore, that General Pierce, since promoted officially above his generous old commander—it is not possible, we say, that he can be a party to this mean partisan opposition of his organ at Washington and its servile echoes in different quarters. No; notwithstanding the recent free soil disclosures touching the antecedents of Gen. Pierce of 1848, we cannot believe that he has forgotten the events of 1847 in the valley of Mexico.

We hope and trust, therefore, that the President will change the music of his Washington organ on this bill for the benefit of General Scott. The spoliators of the House will understand, then, how the land lies; and the starving country echoes of the Union, ready for any turn by which they may gain a few pennies worth of pap, will take their cue accordingly. A word from the President will pass the bill—his silence may defeat it. But the injury will recoil from his old commander with anything but advantage to the administration. Mark that.

STRONGER THAN THE KOZKA CASE.—We hope that Secretary Marcy will not hesitate in making a good case out of the case of the Rev. Mr. Richmond, treated like a pickpocket among the ruffian officials of Austria. Mr. Richmond is a bona fide American citizen. The case is much stronger than the Kozka case